UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/894,607	06/28/2001	Neil S. Fishman	13768.164	5110

7590 11/30/2004

RICK D. NYDEGGER
WORKMAN, NYDEGGER & SEELEY
1000 Eagle Gate Tower
60 East South Temple
Salt Lake City, UT 84111

EXAMINER	
CERVETTI, DAVID GARCIA	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2136	

DATE MAILED: 11/30/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/894,607	FISHMAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	David G. Cervetti	2136	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *28 June 2001*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-34* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *28 June 2001* is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference character(s) not mentioned in the description: Figure 1, all reference characters in Figure 1 are three-digit reference characters, the description refers to two-digit reference characters; Figure 3, reference character 392 is not mentioned in the description. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d), or amendment to the specification to add the reference character(s) in the description in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(b) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: the terms "PIN" (page 2, line 20), "RAM", "ROM", "EEPROM", "CD-ROM" (page 11, line 23), "PC" (page 14, line 22), while well know in the art, these terms have not been defined.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

Claims 1-7, 12-18, 22-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Cohen et al.

Regarding claim 1, Cohen et al. teach in a computerized system that includes one or more clients accessing a gateway and content server that are part of a network, wherein access to the content server requires authentication credentials, the network maintaining gateway authentication credentials that specify one or more access privileges tailored to access through the gateway, a method of authenticating a client comprising a gateway performing the acts of: defining an authentication filter that maps authentication credentials received from clients according to pre-established criteria (column 2, lines 33-42); receiving authentication credentials from a client (column 6, lines 29-37); mapping the received authentication credentials based on the pre-established criteria, the mapped authentication credentials matching gateway authentication credentials maintained on the network and corresponding to client access through the gateway (column 6, lines 19-37); and sending the mapped authentication credentials to the network, wherein the client's access to the content source is determined from the mapped authentication credentials (column 6, lines 38-45).

Regarding claim 2, Cohen et al. teach a method as recited in claim 1 wherein gateway authentication credentials and other authentication credentials are maintained in separate domains, and wherein the act of mapping the received authentication credentials includes changing a domain name that is part of the received authentication credentials (column 7, lines 1-20, figure 8).

Regarding claim 3, Cohen et al. teach a method as recited in claim 2 wherein the act of mapping the received authentication credentials includes replacing the domain name that is part of the received authentication credentials with another domain name (column 7, lines 11-17).

Regarding claim 4, Cohen et al. teach a method as recited in claim 1 wherein the gateway authentication credentials are maintained in a credential database that is administered separately from domain authentication credentials and recognized by the content server only in authenticating client access through the gateway (column 4, lines 60-65, column 5, lines 30-45).

Regarding claim 5, Cohen et al. teach a method as recited in claim 1 wherein gateway authentication credentials and other authentication credentials share a common domain, and wherein the act of mapping the received authentication credentials includes changing a username that is part of the received authentication credentials (column 5, lines 30-45).

Regarding claim 6, Cohen et al. teach a method as recited in claim 5 wherein the act of mapping the received authentication credentials includes adding a suffix to the username (column 5, lines 30-45).

Regarding claim 7, Cohen et al. teach a method as recited in claim 5 wherein the act of mapping the received authentication credentials includes adding a prefix to the username (column 5, lines 30-45).

Regarding claim 12, Cohen et al. teach in a computerized system that includes one or more mobile clients accessing a mobile gateway and content server that are part of a network, wherein access to the content server requires authentication credentials that may contain a combination of numbers, upper case letters, lower case letters, and punctuation, and wherein at least some of the mobile clients use relatively short authentication credentials or have an input system that is optimized for numeric input rather than for letters or punctuation, the network maintaining mobile authentication credentials that specify one or more access privileges tailored to mobile client access, a method of authenticating a mobile client comprising a mobile gateway performing steps for: altering authentication credentials to produce mapped authentication credentials that match mobile authentication credentials maintained on the network (column 9, lines 46-67); identifying a mobile client to the network using the altered authentication credentials (column 9, lines 46-67); and accessing content provided by the network in accordance with the access privileges allowed by the mobile authentication credentials.

Regarding claim 13, Cohen et al. teach a method as recited in claim 12 wherein the step for altering authentication credentials comprises the acts of: defining an authentication filter that maps authentication credentials received from mobile clients according to pre-established criteria (column 2, lines 33-42); and mapping the received authentication credentials based on the pre-established criteria (column 6, lines 19-37).

Regarding claim 14, Cohen et al. teach a method as recited in claim 12 wherein the step for identifying a mobile client comprises the acts of: receiving authentication credentials from a mobile client (column 6, lines 29-37); and sending mapped authentication credentials to the network, wherein the mobile client's access to the content source is determined from the mapped authentication credentials (column 6, lines 38-45).

Regarding claim 15, Cohen et al. teach a method as recited in claim 12 wherein the step for altering authentication credentials includes changing at least one of a domain name and a username that are part of the authentication credentials (column 7, lines 1-20, figure 8).

Regarding claim 16, Cohen et al. teach a method as recited in claim 15 wherein changing at least one of the domain name and a username includes either adding a suffix to the username or replacing the domain name with another domain name (column 5, lines 30-45, column 7, lines 1-20).

Regarding claim 17, Cohen et al. teach a method as recited in claim 12 wherein the mobile authentication credentials are maintained in a credential database that is administered separately from domain authentication credentials and recognized by the content server only in authenticating mobile clients (column 4, lines 60-65, column 5, lines 30-45).

Regarding claim 18, Cohen et al. teach a method as recited in claim 12 wherein mobile authentication credentials and other authentication credentials share a common domain (column 5, lines 30-45).

Regarding claim 22, Cohen et al. teach a method as recited in claim 12 wherein a trust relationship exists between the mobile authentication credentials and other authentication credentials with respect to one or more access privileges (column 6, lines 19-67).

Regarding claim 23, Cohen et al. teach a method as recited in claim 22 wherein the one or more access privileges included within the trust relationship that exists between the mobile authentication credentials and the other authentication credentials comprise a delegate access permission (column 5, lines 15-67, column 6, lines 1-18).

Regarding claim 24, Cohen et al. teach in a computerized system that includes one or more mobile clients accessing a mobile gateway and content server that are part of a network, wherein access to the content server requires authentication credentials that may contain a combination of numbers, upper case letters, lower case letters, and punctuation, and wherein at least some of the mobile clients use relatively short authentication credentials or have an input system that is optimized for numeric input rather than for letters or punctuation, the network maintaining mobile authentication credentials that specify one or more access privileges tailored to mobile client access, a computer program product that implements a method of authenticating a mobile client, comprising: a computer readable medium for carrying machine-executable instructions for implementing the method (column 15, lines 34-58); and wherein said method is comprised of machine-executable instructions for a mobile gateway performing the acts of: defining an authentication filter that maps authentication credentials received from mobile clients according to pre-established criteria (column 2, lines 33-42); receiving

authentication credentials from a mobile client (column 6, lines 29-37); mapping the received authentication credentials based on the pre-established criteria, the mapped authentication credentials matching mobile authentication credentials corresponding to the mobile client and maintained on the network (column 6, lines 19-37); and sending the mapped authentication credentials to the network, wherein the mobile client's access to the content source is determined from the mapped authentication credentials (column 6, lines 38-45).

Regarding claim 25, Cohen et al. teach a computer program product as recited in claim 24 wherein mobile authentication credentials and other authentication credentials are maintained in separate domains, and wherein the act of mapping the received authentication credentials includes changing a domain name that is part of the received authentication credentials (column 7, lines 1-20, figure 8).

Regarding claim 26, Cohen et al. teach a computer program product as recited in claim 25 wherein the act of mapping the received authentication credentials includes replacing the domain name that is part of the received authentication credentials with another domain name (column 7, lines 11-17).

Regarding claim 27, Cohen et al. teach a computer program product as recited in claim 24 wherein the mobile authentication credentials are maintained in a credential database that is administered separately from domain authentication credentials and recognized by the content server only in authenticating mobile clients (column 4, lines 60-65, column 5, lines 30-45).

Regarding claim 28, Cohen et al. teach a computer program product as recited in claim 24 wherein mobile authentication credentials and other authentication credentials share a common domain, and wherein the act of mapping the received authentication credentials includes changing a username that is part of the received authentication credentials (column 5, lines 30-45).

Regarding claim 29, Cohen et al. teach a computer program product as recited in claim 28 wherein the act of mapping the received authentication credentials includes adding a suffix to the username (column 5, lines 30-45).

Regarding claim 30, Cohen et al. teach a computer program product as recited in claim 28 wherein the act of mapping the received authentication credentials includes adding a prefix to the username (column 5, lines 30-45).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 8, 19, 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohen et al. as applied to claims 1, 12, and 24 respectively above and further in view of Puhl et al.

Regarding claim 8, Cohen et al. teach the limitations as set forth under claim 1 above. However, Cohen et al. do not disclose expressly a method as recited in claim 1 wherein the client includes one or more identified wireless application protocol servers providing gateway and content server access to one or more other clients, the method further comprising the act of accepting authentication credentials only from the one or more identified wireless application protocol servers.

Puhl et al. teach a method as recited in claim 1 wherein the client includes one or more identified wireless application protocol servers providing gateway and content server access to one or more other clients (column 9, lines 21-28), the method further comprising the act of accepting authentication credentials only from the one or more identified wireless application protocol servers (column 6, lines 40-55).

Cohen et al. and Puhl et al. are analogous art because they are directed to a similar problem solving area, electronic communications.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use wireless application protocol servers to provide gateway and content server access to clients.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Puhl et al. with the method of Cohen et al. for the benefit of electronic communications to obtain the invention as specified in claim 8.

Regarding claim 19, Cohen et al. teach the limitations as set forth under claim 12 above. However, Cohen et al. do not disclose expressly a method as recited in claim 12 wherein the mobile client includes one or more identified wireless application protocol servers providing mobile gateway and content server access to one or more other mobile clients, the step for identifying a mobile client comprising the act of accepting authentication credentials only from the one or more identified wireless application protocol servers.

Puhl et al. teach a method as recited in claim 12 wherein the mobile client includes one or more identified wireless application protocol servers providing mobile gateway and content server access to one or more other mobile clients (column 9, lines 21-28), the step for identifying a mobile client comprising the act of accepting authentication credentials only from the one or more identified wireless application protocol servers (column 6, lines 40-55).

Cohen et al. and Puhl et al. are analogous art because they are directed to a similar problem solving area, electronic communications.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use wireless application protocol servers to provide gateway and content server access to clients.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Puhl et al. with the method of Cohen et al. for the benefit of electronic communications to obtain the invention as specified in claim 19.

Regarding claim 34, Cohen et al. teach the limitations as set forth under claim 24 above. However, Cohen et al. do not disclose expressly a computer program product as recited in claim 24 wherein the mobile client includes one or more identified wireless application protocol servers providing mobile gateway and content server access to one or more other mobile clients, the method further comprising computer-executable instructions for performing the act of accepting authentication credentials only from the one or more identified wireless application protocol servers.

Puhl et al. teach a computer program product as recited in claim 24 wherein the mobile client includes one or more identified wireless application protocol servers providing mobile gateway and content server access to one or more other mobile clients (column 9, lines 21-28), the method further comprising computer-executable instructions for performing the act of accepting authentication credentials only from the one or more identified wireless application protocol servers (column 6, lines 40-55).

Cohen et al. and Puhl et al. are analogous art because they are directed to a similar problem solving area, electronic communications.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use wireless application protocol servers to provide gateway and content server access to clients.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Puhl et al. with the method of Cohen et al. for the benefit of to obtain the invention as specified in claim 34.

Claims 9, 10, 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohen et al. as applied to claim 1 above and further in view of Starkovich et al.

Claims 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohen et al. as applied to claim 12 above and further in view of Starkovich et al.

Claims 31, 32, 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohen et al. as applied to claim 24 above and further in view of Starkovich et al.

Regarding claim 9, Cohen et al. teach the limitations as set forth under claim 1 above. Cohen et al. teach a method as recited in claim 1 wherein the gateway authentication credentials correspond to other authentication credentials that allow access to a content server, and wherein a trust relationship exists between the gateway authentication credentials and other authentication credentials with respect to one or more access privileges (column 6, lines 19-67). However, Cohen et al. do not disclose expressly the method further comprising the acts of: receiving a request for content available at the content server; sending the request to the network; receiving the requested content from the network; and sending the received content to the client.

Starkovich et al. teach the method further comprising the acts of: receiving a request for content available at the content server; sending the request to the network; receiving the requested content from the network; and sending the received content to the client (figure 1, column 6, lines 15-67, column 7, lines 1-32).

Cohen et al. and Starkovich et al. are analogous art because they are directed to a similar problem solving area, electronic communications.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have the gateway receive the request, forward it to the content server, receive the response from the content server, and forward the response back to the client.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Starkovich et al. with the method of Cohen et al. for the benefit of electronic communications to obtain the invention as specified in claim 9.

Regarding claim 10, Cohen et al. and Starkovich et al. teach the limitations as set forth under claim 9 above. Furthermore, Cohen et al. teach a method as recited in claim 9 wherein the content available at the content server comprises email content (column 2, lines 28-41, column 4, lines 22-35).

Regarding claim 11, Cohen et al. and Starkovich et al. teach the limitations as set forth under claim 9 above. Furthermore, Cohen et al. teach a method wherein the one or more access privileges included within the trust relationship that exists between the gateway authentication credentials and the other authentication credentials comprise a delegate access permission (column 5, lines 15-67, column 6, lines 1-18).

Regarding claim 20, Cohen et al. teach the limitations as set forth under claim 12 above. However, Cohen et al. do not disclose expressly a method as recited in claim 12 wherein the step for accessing content provided by the content server comprises the acts of: receiving a request to access content from the mobile client; sending the request to the network; receiving the requested content from the network; and sending the received content to the mobile client.

Starkovich et al. teach a method as recited in claim 12 wherein the step for accessing content provided by the content server comprises the acts of: receiving a request to access content from the mobile client; sending the request to the network; receiving the requested content from the network; and sending the received content to the mobile client. (figure 1, column 6, lines 15-67, column 7, lines 1-32).

Cohen et al. and Starkovich et al. are analogous art because they are directed to a similar problem solving area, electronic communications.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have the gateway receive the request, forward it to the content server, receive the response from the content server, and forward the response back to the client.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Starkovich et al. with the method of Cohen et al. for the benefit of electronic communications to obtain the invention as specified in claim 20.

Regarding claim 21, Cohen et al. and Starkovich et al. teach the limitations as set forth under claim 20 above. Furthermore, Cohen et al. teach a method as recited in

claim 20 wherein the content is email content (column 2, lines 28-41, column 4, lines 22-35).

Regarding claim 31, Cohen et al. teach the limitations as set forth under claim 24 above. Cohen et al. teach a computer program product as recited in claim 24 wherein the mobile authentication credentials correspond to other authentication credentials that allow access to a content server, and wherein a trust relationship exists between the mobile authentication credentials and other authentication credentials with respect to one or more access privileges (column 6, lines 19-67). However, Cohen et al. do not disclose expressly the method further comprising computer-executable instructions for performing the acts of: receiving a request for content available at the content server; sending the request to the network; receiving the requested content from the network; and sending the received content to the mobile client.

Starkovich et al. teach the method further comprising the acts of: the method further comprising computer-executable instructions for performing the acts of: receiving a request for content available at the content server; sending the request to the network; receiving the requested content from the network; and sending the received content to the mobile client (figure_1, column 6, lines 15-67, column 7, lines 1-32).

Cohen et al. and Starkovich et al. are analogous art because they are directed to a similar problem solving area, electronic communications.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have the gateway receive the request, forward it to the content server,

receive the response from the content server, and forward the response back to the client.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Starkovich et al. with the method of Cohen et al. for the benefit of electronic communications to obtain the invention as specified in claim 31.

Regarding claim 32, Cohen et al. and Starkovich et al. teach the limitations as set forth under claim 31 above. Furthermore, Cohen et al. teach a computer program product as recited in claim 31 wherein the content available at the content server comprises email content (column 2, lines 28-41, column 4, lines 22-35).

Regarding claim 33, Cohen et al. and Starkovich et al. teach the limitations as set forth under claim 31 above. Furthermore, Cohen et al. teach a computer program product as recited in claim 31 wherein the one or more access privileges included within the trust relationship that exists between the mobile authentication credentials and the other authentication credentials comprise a delegate access permission (column 5, lines 15-67, column 6, lines 1-18).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David G. Cervetti whose telephone number is (571) 272-5861. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30 am - 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz R. Sheikh can be reached on (571)272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DGC

AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100